arXiv:1610.02662v1 [math.AP] 9 Oct 2016

On Strongly Nonlinear Eigenvalue Problems in the Framework of Nonreflexive Orlicz-Sobolev Spaces

Edcarlos D. Silva Jose V. A. Goncalves

Kaye O. Silva

Abstract

It is established existence and multiplicity of solutions for strongly nonlinear problems driven by the Φ-Laplacian operator on bounded domains. Our main results are stated without the so called Δ_2 condition at infinity which means that the underlying Orlicz-Sobolev spaces are not reflexive.

2010 AMS Subject Classification: 35J20, 35J25, 35J60.
Key Words: quaselinear equations, multiple solutions, nonreflexive spaces.

1 Introduction

In this work, we study the nonlinear eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}\big(\phi(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\,\big) &= \lambda f(u) \ \text{ in } \ \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathrm{R}^N$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter and $\phi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ is a C^1-function satisfying

(ϕ_1) (i) $t\phi(t) \to 0$ as $t \to 0$,

(ii) $t\phi(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$,

(ϕ_2) $t\phi(t)$ *is strictly increasing in* $(0,\infty)$.

Throughout this work, $f : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a continuous function satisfying

(f_1) $f(0) \geq 0$,

(f_2) *there exist positive numbers* $a_k, b_k,\ k = 1, \cdots, m-1$ *such that*

$$0 < a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < b_2 < ... < b_{m-1} < a_m,$$

$$f(s) \leq 0 \ \text{ if } \ s \in (a_k, b_k),$$

$$f(s) \geq 0 \ \text{ if } \ s \in (b_k, a_{k+1}),$$

(f_3) $\displaystyle\int_{a_k}^{a_{k+1}} f(s)ds > 0,\ k = 1, \cdots, m-1.$

Remark 1.1 *We extend* $t \mapsto t\phi(t)$ *to the whole of* R *as an odd function.*

We shall consider the N-function

$$\Phi(t) = \int_0^t s\phi(s)ds, \quad t \in \mathrm{R},$$

and we shall use the notation

$$\Delta_\Phi u := \operatorname{div}\left(\phi(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\ \right)$$

for the Φ-Laplacian operator. Due to the use of this more general operator we shall work in the framework of Orlicz-Sobolev spaces such as $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ which under our assumptions on ϕ is not reflexive.

The main novelty in this work is to ensure existence and multiplicity of solutions for problem (1.1) without the so called Δ_2 condition which amounts that $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ is not reflexive.

Examples of functions Φ covered by the main theorem in the present work:

$$\Phi(t) = e^t - t + 1, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\Phi(t) = (1 + t^2)^\gamma - 1 \ \text{ where } \ \gamma > \frac{1}{2}, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\Phi(t) = t^p \log(1 + t) \ \text{ where } \ p \geq 1. \tag{1.4}$$

Our main result stated below extends Theorem 1.1 by Loc & Schmitt in [16] to the more general operator Δ_Φ in the case that $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ is not reflexive.

Theorem 1.1 *Assume* $(\phi_1)-(\phi_2)$. *Then*
(i) *if* $(f_1)-(f_3)$ *hold, there is* $\overline{\lambda}>0$ *such that for each* $\lambda>\overline{\lambda}$, (1.1) *admits at least* $m-1$ *non negative weak solutions* $u_1,...,u_{m-1}\in W_0^1L_\Phi(\Omega)\cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ *satisfying*

$$a_1<\|u_1\|_\infty\leq a_2<\|u_2\|_\infty\leq\cdots\leq a_{m-1}<\|u_{m-1}\|_\infty\leq a_m,$$

(ii) *conversely, if* $u\in W_0^1L_\Phi(\Omega)\cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ *is a nonnegative weak solution of problem* (1.1) *such that* $a_k<\|u\|_\infty\leq a_{k+1}$ *and* $(f_1)-(f_2)$ *holds then* (f_3) *also holds true.*

Remark 1.2 *If* f *is extended to the whole of* R *as an odd function then with minor modifications on the arguments of the present work, problem 1.1 admits at least* $2(m-1)$ *weak solutions* $u_1,\dots,u_{m-1}$ *and* $v_1,\dots,v_{m-1}$ *such that* $u_i>0, v_i<0$ *in* $\Omega, i=1,2,\dots,m-1$ *and*

$$a_1<\|u_1\|_\infty\leq a_2<\|u_2\|_\infty\leq\cdots\leq a_{m-1}<\|u_{m-1}\|_\infty\leq a_m,$$

$$a_1<\|v_1\|_\infty\leq a_2<\|v_2\|_\infty\leq\cdots\leq a_{m-1}<\|v_{m-1}\|_\infty\leq a_m.$$

We recall that Hess in [13] employed variational and topological methods and arguments with lower and upper solutions to prove a result on existence of multiple positive solutions for the problem

$$-\Delta u=\lambda f(u)\text{ in }\Omega,\quad u=0\text{ on }\partial\Omega,$$

which is problem (1.1) with $\phi(t)\equiv 1$. As noticed by Hess, the results in [13] were motivated by Brown & Budin [2, 3] which in turn were motivated by the literature on nonlinear heat generation.

In [16], Loc & Schmitt extended the result by Hess to the p-Laplacian operator by taking $\phi(t)=t^{p-2}$ with $1<p<\infty$ in (1.1). Actually, in [16] the authors showed that $(f_1)-(f_3)$ are sufficient conditions for the existence of $m-1$ positive solutions of

$$-\Delta_p u=\lambda f(u)\text{ in }\Omega,\quad u=0\text{ on }\partial\Omega,$$

for λ large, while if $(f_1)-(f_2)$ hold, and u is a positive solution of the problem above with $a_k<\|u\|_\infty\leq a_{k+1}$ then (f_3) holds.

Regarding the rich literature on [13, 16] we further refer the reader to [4, 6, 7, 8], where several techniques were employed.

In particular, in [7], the authors proved a version of Theorem 1.1 in the case that both Φ and its conjugate function $\tilde{\Phi}$ satisfy the Δ_2 condition , or equivalently,

$$\text{there exist } \ell, m \text{ with } 1 < \ell < m < \infty \text{ such that}$$

$$\ell \leq \frac{t\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} \leq m, \ t > 0,$$

see e.g. Section (2) for clarification on notation and terms above.

Examples of functions Φ for which the Δ_2 condition does not hold are (1.2) and (1.4) with $p = 1$. In these two cases Φ grows too slow or too fast, respectively. In the first case we have that $\ell = 1$ while in the second case $m = \infty$.

In the present work, we do not require the Δ_2 condition. Due to the lack of the Δ_2 condition, we have to overcome many difficulties which do not appear in the Δ_2 case. Indeed, without that condition, the Orlicz spaces are not reflexive and the energy functional J associated to problem (1.1) is not C^1, in fact, it is not even well defined in the whole Orlicz-Sobolev space. This difficulty is overcome by working in some appropriate subspaces in the Orlicz-Sobolev space. On this subject we refer the reader to Gossez [11] and García-Huidobro et al [9]. For further results without Δ_2, we refer the reader to Le Vy Khoi [14], Loc & Schmitt [16], V. Mustonen & M. Tienari [17] and M. Tienari [18], Clément et. al. [5],

Other classes of functions ϕ which satisfy $(\phi_1) - (\phi_2)$ are:

(i) $\phi(t) = t^{p-2} + t^{q-2}$ with $1 < p < q < N$. In this case with $\ell = p$ and $m = q$, the corresponding operator is the (p, q)-Laplacian and (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u = \lambda f(u) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

(ii) $\phi(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} t^{p_i - 2}$ where $1 < p_1 < p_2 < ... < p_N$, $\frac{1}{\overline{p}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{p_i}$ with $\overline{p} < N$. In this case the corresponding problem

$$\begin{cases} -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta_{p_i} u = \lambda f(u) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

is known in the literature as an anisotropic elliptic problem,

(iii) $\phi(t) = a(t^p)t^{p-2}$ where $2 \leq p < N$ and $a : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ is a suitable $C^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$-function. In this case the corresponding problem reads as

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div}(a(|\nabla u|^p)|u|^{p-2}\nabla u) = \lambda f(u) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

This work is organized as follows: in Section 2 we present some tools and references on Orlicz-Sobolev spaces. Section 3 is devoted to some auxiliary problems and the variational setting. Section 4 is devoted to some technical lemmata. In Section 5 we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. In the Appendix we give, for completeness, some technical results used in this work.

2 Basics on Orlicz-Sobolev Spaces

The main references for this Section are Gossez [11, 12], Adams [1], Kufner [15] and Tienari [18]. Further references will be given timely.

Let $\Phi : \mathrm{R} \to \mathrm{R}$ be an N-Function. We say that Φ satisfies the Δ_2 condition if there exist $t_0 > 0$ and $K > 0$ such that

$$\Phi(2t) \leq K\Phi(t),\ |t| \geq t_0. \tag{2.1}$$

It is well known that this condition is equivalent to

$$\frac{t\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} \leq m,\ |t| \geq t_0 \text{ for some } m \in (1,\infty).$$

The Δ_2 condition is crucial to ensure that Orlicz and Orlicz-Sobolev spaces are reflexive Banach spaces.

The Orlicz class associated with Φ is

$$\mathcal{L}(\Omega) = \left\{ u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \mid u \text{ measurable and } \int_\Omega \Phi(u)dx < \infty \right\}.$$

The Orlicz space $L_\Phi(\Omega)$ is the linear hull of $\mathcal{L}_\Phi(\Omega)$, that is,

$$L_\Phi(\Omega) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{L}(\Omega)\subset V} \{V \mid V \text{is a vector space }\}.$$

The norm of a function $u \in L_\Phi(\Omega)$, (Luxemburg norm), is defined by

$$\|u\|_\Phi = \inf\left\{ \lambda > 0 \mid \int_\Omega \Phi\left(\frac{u}{\lambda}\right) \leq 1 \right\}$$

and $L_\Phi(\Omega)$ endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Phi$ is a Banach space. On the other hand, the space $E_\Phi(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$E_\Phi(\Omega) = \text{closure of } L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ in } L_\Phi(\Omega) \text{ with respect to } \|\cdot\|_\Phi.$$

We recall that

$$L_\Phi(\Omega) = \Big\{u \mid \int_\Omega \Phi(\lambda u) < \infty \text{ for some } \lambda > 0\Big\}.$$

and

$$E_\Phi(\Omega) = \Big\{u \mid \int_\Omega \Phi(\lambda u) < \infty \text{ for each } \lambda > 0\Big\}.$$

It is well known that $L_\Psi(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$ (cf. Adams [1]).
The Orlicz-Sobolev space is defined by

$$W^1L_\Phi(\Omega) = \Big\{u \in L_\Phi(\Omega) \mid \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \in L_\Phi(\Omega),\ i = 1, ..., N\Big\},$$

and similarly

$$W^1E_\Phi(\Omega) = \Big\{u \in E_\Phi(\Omega) \mid \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \in E_\Phi(\Omega),\ i = 1, ..., N\Big\}$$

It is known that $W^1L_\Phi(\Omega)$ endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{1,\Phi} = \|u\|_\Phi + \sum_{i=1}^N \Big\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\Big\|_\Phi$$

is a Banach space
We point out that by the Poincaré Inequality (see [11, Lemma 5.7 p 202]),

$$\|u\| := \|\nabla u\|_\Phi,\ u \in W^1L_\Phi(\Omega)$$

defines a norm in $W_0^1L_\Phi(\Omega)$ equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{1,\Phi}$.
The conjugate function of Φ is defined by

$$\widetilde{\Phi}(t) = \sup\{ts - \Phi(s) \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

It is known that $\widetilde{\Phi}$ is also an N-function and actually

$$\widetilde{\Phi}(t) = \int_0^{|t|} t\widetilde{\phi}(t)dt \text{ for a suitable function } \widetilde{\phi}.$$

where $\widetilde{\phi}$ satisfies the same basic conditions as ϕ. The Young inequality holds,

$$ts \leq \Phi(t) + \widetilde{\Phi}(s),\ t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.2}$$

and the equality is true if and only if $t = s\widetilde{\phi}(s)$ or $s = t\phi(t)$.

It is well known that $L_\Phi(\Omega)$ is the dual space of $E_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$, that is

$$L_\Phi(\Omega) = E_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)'.$$

The Hölder inequality is true, that is

$$\int_\Omega |uv| \leq 2\|u\|_\Phi \|v\|_{\widetilde{\Phi}},\ u \in L_\Phi(\Omega),\ v \in L_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega).$$

Yet following Gossez [11, 12] we recall that the spaces $W^1L_\Phi(\Omega)$ and $W^1E_\Phi(\Omega)$ are identified with subspaces of the product spaces $\prod L_\Phi(\Omega)$, $\prod E_\Phi(\Omega)$, respectively.

We define

$$W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) = \overline{C_0^\infty(\Omega)}^{\sigma\left(\prod L_\Phi(\Omega), \prod E_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)\right)},$$
$$W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega) = \overline{C_0^\infty(\Omega)}^{(E_\Phi, \|u\|_{1,\Phi})}.$$

3 Auxiliary Problems and Variational Setting

Consider the family of problems associated to (1.1)

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} -\Delta_\Phi u & = & \lambda f_k(u) \ \text{ in } \ \Omega, \\ u & = & 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{3.1}$$

where $f_k : \mathrm{R} \to \mathrm{R}$ is a continuous function for each $k = 2, \cdots, m$ which is given by

$$f_k(s) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f(0) & \text{if} s \leq 0, \\ f(s) & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq a_k, \\ 0 & \text{if } s > a_k. \end{array} \right.$$

Here we emphasize that f_k is a bounded function which has at least m bumps. The energy functional associated to the problem (3.1) is given by

$$I_k(\lambda, u) = \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|)dx - \lambda \int_\Omega F_k(u)dx,\ u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega),$$

where

$$F_k(s) = \int_0^s f_k(t)dt, k = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1.$$

Now we observe that $I_k(\lambda,\cdot) : W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \to \mathrm{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. In fact, the domain of I_k, that is the set for which I_k is finite, is

$$\{u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \mid |\nabla u| \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega)\}.$$

Moreover, there are points in $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ where I_k is not differentiable. However, we mention that I_k is differentiable in $W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega)$, (cf. [9, Lemma 3.4]). In this way, we say that $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ is a weak solution for problem (3.1) if

$$\int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx = \lambda \int_\Omega f_k(u) v dx,\ v \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega).$$

Remark 3.1 *When working with the Δ_2 condition in both Φ and $\tilde{\Phi}$, the energy functional I_k is C^1 (which is easy to prove), and so, every critical point of I_k satisfies the Euler equation above. Without Δ_2 condition, the lack of differentiability is a problem which we have to overcome in order to show that the minimum of I_k satisfies the above Euler equation.*

4 Technical Lemmas

The result below is crucial in this work and it was proved originally by Hess [13] and then extended by Loc & Schmitt in [16] to more general Sobolev spaces. In the present paper due to the non-reflexivity of the Orlicz-Sobolev space $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ it was necessary to employ a version of Stampacchia's theorem for that space. See Proposition 6.1in the Appendix.

Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_\Phi u = g(u) \ \text{ in } \ \Omega, \\ \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

The result is:

Lemma 4.1 *Let $g : \mathrm{R} \to \mathrm{R}$ be a continuous function such that $g(s) \geq 0$ for $s \in (-\infty, 0)$ and assume that there is some $s_0 \geq 0$ such that $g(s) \leq 0$ for $s \geq s_0$. Let $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ be a weak solution for the problem (4.1). Then $0 \leq u \leq s_0$ a.e. in Ω.*

Proof. Let $\Omega_0 = \{x \in \Omega : \ u(x) < 0\}$. Using Proposition 6.1 in the Appendix, with the function $\min\{t, 0\}$, we can take u^- as a test function.

As a consequence we know that

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \phi(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_0} g(u)u dx.$$

In particular, the last assertion says that

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \phi(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|^2 dx \leq 0,$$

which implies that Ω_0 has zero measure. Again, define $\Omega_{s_0} = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > s_0\}$. Using Proposition 6.1, with the function $\max\{t - s_0, 0\}$, we take $(u - s_0)^+$ as a test function. As a byproduct we get

$$\int_{\Omega_{s_0}} \phi(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_{s_0}} g(u)(u - s_0) dx,$$

showing that

$$\int_{\Omega_{s_0}} \phi(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|^2 dx \leq 0.$$

Therefore the set Ω_{s_0} has zero measure. □

The result below is crucial. In the case that the Δ_2 condition holds its proof is rather straightforward. In the setting of the present paper it is much more difficult. We shall detail it by using arguments employed in [9] and [17].

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\lambda > 0$. Then there is $v_k \equiv v_k(\lambda) \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ such that*

$$I_k(\lambda, v_k) = \min_{u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)} I_k(\lambda, u).$$

Proof. It is enough to show that $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$ is both coercive and weak* sequentially lower semicontinuous, ($w^\star$.s.l.s.c. for short).

In order to show the coercivity property for $I_k(\lambda,)$ take $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ such that $\|u\| \geq 1 + \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$. Once Φ is convex and satisfies $\Phi(0) = 0$ we have that

$$\frac{1+\epsilon}{\|u\|} \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|) dx \geq \int_\Omega \Phi\left(\frac{(1+\epsilon)|\nabla u|}{\|u\|}\right) dx > 1.$$

In the last inequality it was used the definition for Luxemburg norm. Here we point out that f_k is a bounded function for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$. The coerciveness follows by a straightforward argument.

In order to show that $I_k(\lambda,\cdot)$ is $w^\star$.s.l.s.c., we first prove that

$$u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \mapsto \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|)dx$$

is $w^\star$.s.l.s.c.. Indeed, it follows by Young's inequality (2.2) that

$$\int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|)dx = \sup\left\{\int_\Omega |\nabla u| w dx - \int_\Omega \tilde{\Phi}(w)dx \mid w \in E_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)\right\}.$$

Assume that $u_n \overset{w^\star}{\rightharpoonup} u$. Given $\epsilon > 0$ it follows from the previous identity that there is $w \in E_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u_n|)dx \geq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| w dx - \int_\Omega \tilde{\Phi}(w)dx$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|)dx \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u| w dx - \int_\Omega \tilde{\Phi}(w)dx + \epsilon.$$

Due the fact that $|\nabla u|, |\nabla u_n| \geq 0$, we may assume without loss of generality that $w \geq 0$. As a consequence

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u_n|)dx - \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|)dx &\geq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| w dx - \int_\Omega |\nabla u| w dx - \epsilon \\ &= \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n w| dx - \int_\Omega |\nabla u w| dx - \epsilon \quad (4.2)\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_i} v dx \to \int_\Omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} v dx, \ v \in E_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega),$$

and $E_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)L^\infty(\Omega) = E_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$ (see [18]), we have that $\nabla u_n w \to \nabla u w$ for $\sigma(\prod L^1(\Omega), \prod L^\infty(\Omega))$. Hence, by the weak lower semicontinuity of norms, we conclude that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u| w dx \leq \liminf \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| w dx.$$

This inequality and (4.2) imply that

$$\liminf \int_\Omega \Phi|\nabla u_n|)dx \geq \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|)dx - \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ was taken arbitrarily, we obtain that

$$u \mapsto \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla u|)dx, u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$$

is a $w^\star$.s.l.s.c. function. Now, we shall prove that

$$\int_\Omega F(u_n)dx \to \int_\Omega F(u)dx$$

First of all, using the compact embedding $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \overset{cpt}{\hookrightarrow} L_\Psi(\Omega)$ for $\Psi << \Phi^\star$ and the continuous embedding $L_\Psi(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$ we conclude that

$$W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \overset{cpt}{\hookrightarrow} L^1(\Omega).$$

Consequently we can take a function $h \in L^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$u_n \to u \text{ and } |u_n| \leq h \text{ a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Using the dominated convergence theorem we have

$$\int_\Omega F_k(u_n)dx \to \int_\Omega F_k(u)dx.$$

It follows from the previous arguments that

$$I_k(\lambda, u) \leq \liminf I_k(\lambda, u_n).$$

As a consequence, there is a minimum $v_k \equiv v_k(\lambda)$ of $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$. □

Now we shall prove that v_k is in fact a weak solution of problem (3.1). In order to do that, we will show that the functional I_k is differentiable at its minimum point, found in Lemma 4.2. We first give some auxiliary results and definitions which can be found in [17].

Definition 4.1 *Let*

$$\text{dom}(\phi(t)t) = \{u \in L_\Phi(\Omega) : \ \phi(|u|)|u| \in L_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)\}.$$

For the next result we infer the reader to [17, Lemma 4.1].

Lemma 4.3 *For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ we have*

(i) $(1-\epsilon)\mathcal{L}_\Phi(\Omega) \subset \text{dom}(\phi(t)t)$,

(ii) $(1-\epsilon)\mathcal{L}_\Phi(\Omega) + E_\Phi(\Omega) \subset (1-\epsilon/2)\mathcal{L}_\Phi(\Omega) \subset \text{dom}(\phi(t)t)$.

Proof. At forst we show (i): take $u \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega)$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. By the Young inequality (2.2), we easily see that (recall that by taking $s = t\phi(t)$ we obtain the equality in the Young inequality) $\tilde{\Phi}(t\phi(t)) \leq t(t\phi(t))$. We also see that (due the fact that $t\phi(t)$ is increasing) that $t(t\phi(t)) \leq \Phi(2t)$.

Therefore

$$\frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\tilde{\Phi}((1-\epsilon)u\phi((1-\epsilon)u)) \leq \epsilon(1-\epsilon)u\phi((1-\epsilon)u). \tag{4.3}$$

Now due the fact that $t\phi(t)$ is increasing, we obtain that

$$\epsilon(1-\epsilon)u\phi((1-\epsilon)u) \leq \int_{(1-\epsilon)u}^{u} s\phi(s)ds \leq \Phi(u). \tag{4.4}$$

Using (4.3) and (4.4) together, we conclude the proof of item i).
For the item ii) we put $v \in E_\Phi(\Omega)$. Note that

$$\frac{v}{1-\epsilon/2} = \frac{2}{\epsilon}\left(1 - \frac{1-\epsilon}{1-\epsilon/2}\right)v.$$

Therefore, using the convexity of Φ, we obtain that

$$\Phi\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon/2}((1-\epsilon)u+v)\right) \leq \frac{1-\epsilon}{1-\epsilon/2}\Phi(u) + \left(1 - \frac{1-\epsilon}{1-\epsilon/2}\right)\Phi\left(\frac{2v}{\epsilon}\right).$$

This assertion implies that

$$(1-\epsilon)\mathcal{L}_\Phi(\Omega) + E_\Phi(\Omega) \subset (1-\epsilon/2)\mathcal{L}_\Phi(\Omega).$$

Now using item i) the proof for item ii) is now finished. □

Now we shall prove, with some adapted ideas from Tienari [17], that $|\nabla v_k| \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi(t)t)$.

Lemma 4.4 *The function $|\nabla v_k|$ satisfies $\phi(|\nabla v_k|)|\nabla v_k| \in \mathcal{L}_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Consider the following sequence $f_k(\epsilon) = I_k(\lambda, (1-\epsilon)v_k)$ for any $\epsilon \in [0,1]$. Recall that v_k is the minimizer of $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$. This ensures that $f_k(\epsilon) < \infty$ is finite for any $\epsilon \in [0,1]$. Moreover, we observe that $|\nabla v_k| \in \mathcal{L}_\Phi(\Omega)$. Therefore, using the item i) of Lemma 4.3, we already conclude that f_k is differentiable in the interval $(0,1]$. Furthermore, we know that

$$f_k'(\epsilon) = -\int_\Omega \phi((1-\epsilon)|\nabla v_k|)(1-\epsilon)|\nabla v_k|^2 dx + \lambda \int_\Omega f_k((1-\epsilon)v_k)v_k dx. \tag{4.5}$$

Suppose, on the contrary that $\phi(|\nabla v_k|)|\nabla v_k| \notin \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$. Recall from Young inequality (2.2) that

$$\int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla v_k|)|\nabla v_k|^2 dx = \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla v_k|)dx + \int_\Omega \tilde{\Phi}(\phi|\nabla v_k|)|\nabla v_k| dx = \infty.$$

From the last equality and (4.5), we mention that $f'(\epsilon) \to -\infty$ if $\epsilon \to 0$. Hence, there exists $\epsilon_0 \in (0,1]$ such that $f(\epsilon_0) < f(0)$ which is an contradiction because of v_r is a minimizer for $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$. □

With the help of the last Lemma, we can now prove that the minimum we found in Lemma 4.2 does satisfies the Euler equation:

Lemma 4.5 *For v_k as defined in lemma (4.2) we have*

$$\int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla v_k|)\nabla v_k \nabla w dx = \lambda \int_\Omega f(v_k) w dx, \ w \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega).$$

Proof. Let $v \in W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega)$ and define

$$f_v(\epsilon) = I_k(\lambda, v_\epsilon), \ \epsilon \in [0,1],$$

where $v_\epsilon = 1/(1-\epsilon/2)[(1-\epsilon)v_k + \epsilon v]$. The item (ii) of lemma 4.3 and Young inequality (2.2) imply that $f_v(\epsilon) < \infty$ for all $\epsilon \in [0,1]$. Once v_k is a minimizer of $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$, we have that

$$0 \leq \frac{f_v(\epsilon) - f_v(0)}{\epsilon}, \ v \in W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega). \tag{4.6}$$

Note that for $\epsilon < 2/3$, the monotonicity of $\phi(t)t$ and the triangle inequality, the following is true

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\Phi(|\nabla v_\epsilon|) - \Phi(|\nabla v_k|)}{\epsilon} \right| &\leq (\phi(|\nabla v_\epsilon|)|\nabla v_\epsilon| + \phi(|\nabla u_k|)|\nabla u_k|) \frac{|\nabla v_\epsilon - \nabla v_k|}{\epsilon}, \\ &\leq (2\phi(|\nabla v_k|)|\nabla v_k| + \phi(|\nabla v|)|\nabla v|)(|\nabla v_k| + |\nabla v|). \end{aligned}$$

As $|\nabla v| \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi(t)t)$ for every $v \in W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega)$ (this is true because of the inequality $\tilde{\Phi}(\phi(t)t) \leq \Phi(2t)$), we conclude that the right hand side of the last inequality, is a function in $L^1(\Omega)$. Now using the fact that

$$\frac{\Phi(|\nabla v_\epsilon|) - \Phi(|\nabla v_k|)}{\epsilon} \to \phi(|\nabla v_k|)\nabla v_k(\nabla v - \nabla v_k/2), \text{ a.e., } x \in \Omega, \text{ when } \epsilon \to 0,$$

we infer from inequality (4.6) and Lebesgue theorem that

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla v_k|)\nabla v_k(\nabla v - \nabla v_k/2)dx - \lambda \int_\Omega f(v_k)(v - v_k/2)dx, \ v \in W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega).$$

As a consequence

$$\int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla v_k|)\nabla v_k \nabla v = \lambda \int_\Omega f(v_k)v dx,\ lv \in W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega).$$

At this moment, using the weak star density of $W_0^1 E_\Phi(\Omega)$ in $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$, we mention that

$$\int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla v_k|)\nabla v_k \nabla v dx = \lambda \int_\Omega f(v_k)v dx,\ v \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega).$$

Hence v_k is a weak solution to the problem (1.1). This finishes the proof for this lemma. □

To continue, we shall prove that $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$ admits at least one weak solution v_k satisfying $a_k < \|v_k\|_\infty \leq a_{k+1}, k = 1, \ldots, m-1$. This is crucial in order to get our main result.

Lemma 4.6 *There is $\lambda_k > 0$ such that*

$$a_{k-1} < \|v_k\|_\infty \leq a_k$$

for each minimum $v_k \equiv v_k(\lambda)$ of $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$ with $\lambda > \lambda_k$.

Proof. The proof is similar to those given in [13] and [16] and the idea is the following: Take $\delta > 0$ and consider the open set

$$\Omega_\delta = \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}.$$

Set

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_k := F(a_k) - \max\{F(s) \mid 0 \leq s \leq a_{k-1}\}$$

and note that by (f_3), $\widetilde{\alpha}_k > 0$. Choose $w_\delta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$0 \leq w_\delta \leq a_k \text{ and } w_\delta(x) = a_k,\ x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_\delta.$$

Writing $\Omega = \Omega_\delta \cup (\Omega \setminus \Omega_\delta)$ and setting $C_k = \max\{|F(s)| \mid 0 \leq s \leq a_k\}$ we get to,

$$\int_\Omega F(w_\delta)dx \geq \int_\Omega F(a_k)dx - 2C_k|\Omega_\delta|.$$

Let $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ such that $0 \leq u \leq a_{k-1}$. By the inequality above we have

$$\int_\Omega F(w_\delta)dx - \int_\Omega F(u)dx \geq \widetilde{\alpha}_k|\Omega| - 2C_k|\Omega_\delta|.$$

Since $|\Omega_\delta| \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\eta_k := \widetilde{\alpha}_k|\Omega| - 2C_k|\Omega_\delta| > 0.$$

Set $w = w_\delta$ and pick $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ with $0 \leq u \leq a_{k-1}$. Choosing $\lambda_k > 0$ large enough, taking $\lambda \geq \lambda_k$ and making use of the expessions of $I_k(\lambda, w_\delta), I_{k-1}(\lambda, u)$ and the inequality just above we infer that

$$I_k(\lambda, w_\delta) - I_{k-1}(\lambda, u) \leq \int_\Omega \Phi(|\nabla w_\delta|)dx - \lambda\eta_k < 0 \tag{4.7}$$

and hence

$$I_k(\lambda, w_\delta) < I_{k-1}(\lambda, u) \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \geq \lambda_k. \tag{4.8}$$

To finish, assume, on the contrary, that there is a minimum $v_k(\lambda)$ of $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$ such that $v_k(\lambda) \leq a_{k-1}$. It follows by (4.8) and lemma 4.1 that

$$I_k(\lambda, w_\delta) < I_{k-1}(\lambda, v_k(\lambda)).$$

On the other hand, because $I_{k-1}(\lambda, v_k(\lambda)) = I_k(\lambda, v_k(\lambda))$ and since $v_k(\lambda)$ is a minimum of $I_k(\lambda, \cdot)$ we have

$$I_{k-1}(\lambda, v_k(\lambda)) = I_k(\lambda, v_k) \leq I_k(\lambda, w_\delta).$$

The inequalities just above lead to a contradiction. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The proof is based on Loc & Schmitt [16]. However, we will get into details taking into account the Orlicz-Sobolev spaces framework. In this sense we will make use of a general result on lower and upper solutions by Le [14, theorem 3.2].

For the proof of (ii) we will need the lemma below. In order to state it, take an open ball B centered at 0 with radius R containing Ω. Consider the functions $\alpha, \beta : \overline{B} \to \mathrm{R}$ defined as follows:

$$\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} u(x), & x \in \overline{\Omega} \\ 0, & x \in \overline{B} \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \qquad \beta(x) = a_{k+1},\ x \in \overline{B}.$$

Since $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$, we know by the Lemma (6.1) in the Appendix, that the extension by zero $\overline{u}$ of u belongs to $W_0^1 L_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Hence, due to the fact that the extension by zero of the function α to $\mathbb{R}^N$, coincides with $\overline{u}$, we also conclude by using Lemma (6.1) (appendix) again that $\alpha \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(B)$.

Lemma 5.1 *The functions β and α are respectively upper and lower solutions to the elliptic problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_\Phi u = \lambda f(u) \text{ in } B, \\ \\ \quad u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(B). \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. That β is an upper solution is immediately. Now we shall prove that α is a subsolution for the problem (5.1). Let $v_n(x) = n \min\{u(x), 1/n\}$ be a fixed function. Note that $u_n(x) \to 1$ for each x where $u(x) \neq 0$ and $u(x) \to 0$ for each x where $u(x) = 0$. Moreover, on the set $\{x \in \Omega : \ u(x) = 0\}$, we have that $\nabla u(x) = 0$ a.e.. Therefore, for each $v \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ with $v \geq 0$, the following inequalities are true

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \phi(|\nabla \alpha|)\nabla \alpha \nabla v dx &= \int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \nabla v dx \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega v_n \phi(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \nabla v dx \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \nabla (v_n v) dx - \int_\Omega v \phi(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \nabla v_n dx \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(u) v_n v dx \\ &\leq \int_B f(\alpha) v dx. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

Proof of (i) **of theorem 1.1**. Take $\lambda > 0$. By lemma 4.2, for each $k = 2, \cdots, m$ there is a minimum $v_k \equiv v_k(\lambda)$ of $I_k(\lambda)$, which is actually a weak solution of problem (3.1). By lemma 4.1, we know that $0 \leq v_k \leq a_k$ a.e. in Ω.

Now we mention that, using Lemma 4.6, there is $\overline{\lambda} \geq \max\limits_{2\leq k\leq m} \{\lambda_k\}$ such that $v_2, \cdots, v_m$ are solutions of problem (1.1) for any $\lambda > \overline{\lambda}$. Moreover, these solutions satisfy

$$a_1 < \|v_2\|_\infty \leq a_2 < \|v_3\|_\infty \leq \cdots \leq a_{m-1} < \|v_m\|_\infty \leq a_m$$

Now we take $u_{k-1} \equiv v_k(\lambda), \ k = 2, \cdots, m$. This ends the proof of the first part of theorem 1.1 .

Proof of (ii) **of theorem 1.1**. We distinguish between two cases.

Case 1 $f(0) > 0$.

This case is more difficult. In order to address it we state and prove the lemma below.

Lemma 5.2 *Assume* $(\phi_1)-(\phi_4)$, $(f_1)-(f_2)$ *and* $f(0) > 0$. *If* u *is a non-negative weak solution of* (1.1) *such that* $a_{k-1} < \|u\|_\infty \leq a_k$ *then*

$$\int_{a_k}^{a_{k+1}} f(s)ds > 0.$$

Proof Let us consider the case that $k = 2$, the other cases may be treated in a similar manner. Take the lower and upper solutions respectively α and a_2 for (5.1).

Now, applying Theorems 3.2, 4.1 and 5.1 of [14], we find a maximal solution say $\overline{u}$ of (5.1) such that $\alpha(x) \leq \overline{u}(x) \leq a_2$ for $x \in B$.

The verification of the **Claim** below follows as in [16].

Claim 5.1 $\overline{u}$ *is radially symmetric, i.e.* $\overline{u}(x_1) = \overline{u}(x_2),\ x_i \in B,\ |x_1| = |x_2|$.

Now we set

$$u(r) = \overline{u}(x) \text{ where } r = |x| \text{ and } x \in B,$$

and because the extension by zero outside of Ω, of the function $\overline{u}$, is an absolutely continuous function, with respect to a.e. segment of line in the direction of a vector $\eta \in \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|y\| = 1\}$, we conclude that u is continuous in $(0, R]$ and

$$u \in W^{1,1}(0, R),\ u(1) = 0.$$

Let $r \in (0, R)$ and pick $\epsilon > 0$ small such that $r + \epsilon < R$. Note that

$$\int_B \phi(|\nabla \overline{u}|)\nabla \overline{u}\nabla v dx = \lambda \int_B f(\overline{u})v dx,\ v \in W_0^{1,\Phi}(B). \tag{5.2}$$

Consider the radially symmetric cut-off function $v_{r,\epsilon}(x) = v_{r,\epsilon}(r)$, where

$$v_{r,\epsilon}(t) := \begin{cases} 1 \ \text{ if } \ 0 \leq t \leq r, \\ \textit{linear} \ \text{ if } \ r \leq t \leq r + \epsilon, \\ 0 \ \text{ if } \ r + \epsilon \leq t \leq R. \end{cases}$$

and notice that $v_{r,\epsilon} \in W_0^{1,\Phi}(B) \cap Lip(\overline{B})$. Setting $v = v_{r,\epsilon}$ in (5.2) and using the radial symmetry we get to

$$\frac{-1}{\epsilon}\int_r^{r+\epsilon} t^{N-1}\phi(|u'|)u'\ dt = \int_0^r t^{N-1}\ \lambda f(u)\ dt + \int_r^{r+\epsilon} t^{N-1}\lambda f(u)v dt.$$

Once $t^{N-1}\phi(|u'|)u' \in L^1(0,R)$, we conlude by letting $\epsilon \to 0$, that for a.e. $r \in (0,R)$

$$-r^{N-1}\phi(|u'(r)|)u'(r) = \int_0^r \lambda f(u)t^{N-1}\,dt,\ 0 < r < R. \tag{5.3}$$

From equation (5.3) and by the boundedness of u, we obtain that u' is continuous and $u'(0) = 0$. Set

$$\|u\|_\infty = \max\{u(r) \mid r \in [0,R]\},$$

and choose numbers $r_0, r_1 \in [0,R)$ with $r_1 \in (r_0,R)$ such that

$$u(r_0) = \|u\|_\infty \text{ and } u(r_1) = a_1.$$

Note that

$$u(r_0) > u(r_1) \text{ and } 0 \le r_0 < r_1 < R.$$

Claim 5.2 $\|u\|_\infty > b_1$.

Indeed, assume on the contrary that, $u(r_0) \le b_1$. Take $\delta > 0$ small such that

$$a_1 < u(r) \le u(r_0), \quad r_0 \le r \le r_0 + \delta.$$

We have by (5.3)

$$-r_0^{N-1}\phi(|u'(r_0)|)u'(r_0) = \int_0^{r_0} \lambda f(u)t^{N-1}\,dt, \tag{5.4}$$

$$-r^{N-1}\phi(|u'(r)|)u'(r) = \int_0^r \lambda f(u)t^{N-1}\,dt. \tag{5.5}$$

Subtracting (5.5) from (5.4) and recalling that $u'(r_0) = 0$ one obtains,

$$-r^{N-1}\phi(|u'(r)|)u'(r) = \int_{r_0}^r \lambda f(u)t^{N-1}\,dt,\ r_0 \le r \le r_0 + \delta.$$

Since $f \le 0$ on $[a_1, b_1]$,

$$r^{N-1}\phi(|u'(r)|)u'(r) \ge 0,\ r_0 \le r \le r_0 + \delta.$$

It follows that $u'(r) \ge 0$ for $r_0 \le r \le r_0 + \delta$. But, since $u(r_0)$ is a global maximum on $[0,R]$, it follows that $u' = 0$ on $[r_0, r_0 + \delta]$. By a continuation argument we get $u' = 0$ on $[r_0, r_1)$ so that $u = \|u\|_\infty$ on $[r_0, r_1]$, contradicting $u(r_0) > a_1$. As a consequence, $\|u\|_\infty > b_1$, proving Claim 5.2.

Claim 5.3 *$u \in C^2(\mathcal{O})$ where $\mathcal{O} := \{r \in (0,R) \mid u'(r) \neq 0\}$.*

Of course $\mathcal{O}$ is an open set. Motivated by the left hand side of (5.3) consider

$$G(z) = \phi(z)z, \quad z \in \mathrm{R},$$

where z is set to play the role of u'. Recall that

$$G \text{ is odd}, \quad G'(z) = (\phi(z)z)' > 0 \text{ for } z > 0$$

and

$$G(z) = \phi(|u'(r)|)u'(r) = -\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r \lambda f(u) t^{N-1}\, dt.$$

Since $\phi(z)z \in C^1$ and $(\phi(z)z)' \neq 0$ for $z \neq 0$, we get by applying the Inverse Function Theorem in $\mathcal{O}$ that $z = z(r,u)$ is a C^1-function of r. Since $z = u'$, the claim is proved.

Claim 5.4 $\int_{a_1}^{\|u\|_\infty} f(s)ds > 0$.

Differentiating in (5.3) and multiplying by u' we get

$$\big(t^{N-1}\phi(|u'(t)|)u'(t)\big)'u'(t) = -\lambda f(u(t))u'(t)t^{N-1},$$

and hence

$$\frac{(N-1)}{t}\phi(|u'|)(u')^2 + (\phi(|u'|)u')'u' = -\lambda f(u)u'.$$

Integrating from r_0 to r_1 we have

$$-\Big[\int_{r_0}^{r_1} \frac{(N-1)}{t}\phi(|u'|)(u')^2 dt + \int_{r_0}^{r_1} \big[\phi(|u'|)u'\big]'u' dt\Big] = \int_{r_0}^{r_1} \lambda f(u)u' dt. \tag{5.6}$$

Making the change of variables $s = u'(t)$ in the second and third integrals in (5.6) and applying the arguments in [16] leads to **Claim 5.4**.

Since $f \geq 0$ on (b_1, a_2) and $\|u\|_\infty > b_1$ it follows that

$$\int_{a_1}^{a_2} f(s)ds > 0,$$

ending the proof of lemma 5.2. □

Case 2 $f(0) = 0$.

This case is handled as in [16]. The Theorem 1.1 is now proved. □

6 Appendix

In this Section we state and prove a version of the Stampacchia Theorem (generalized Chain Rule) for the case of nonreflexive Orlicz-Sobolev spaces.

Proposition 6.1 *Let $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz continuous function such that $\|g'\|_\infty < M$ and $g(0) = 0$. Let $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$. Then $g(u) \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ and*

$$\frac{\partial g(u)}{\partial x_i} = g'(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \quad a.e.\ in\ \ \Omega.$$

At first we recall, for the reader's convenience, the definition and basic properties of the trace on $\partial\Omega$ of an element of $W^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$. We refer the reader to Gossez [12].

Let $\gamma : C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}) \to C(\partial\Omega)$ be defined by the linear map $\gamma(u) = u_{|\partial\Omega}$. Then γ is continuous with respect to the topologies

$$\sigma\left(\prod L_\Phi(\Omega), \prod E_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)\right) \text{ and } \sigma(L_\Phi(\partial\Omega), E_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\partial\Omega)).$$

Using the facts that $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is dense in $W^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ with respect to the topology $\sigma\left(\prod L_\Phi(\Omega), \prod E_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)\right)$ and $C(\partial\Omega)$ is dense in $L_\Phi(\partial\Omega)$ with respect to the topology $\sigma(L_\Phi(\partial\Omega), E_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\partial\Omega))$, γ admits an only continuous extension to a linear map namely $\gamma : W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \to L_\Phi(\partial\Omega)$.
It can be shown that

$$W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) = \{u \in W^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \mid \gamma(u) = 0\}.$$

Let $u : \Omega \to \mathrm{R}$. We define $\overline{u} : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\overline{u}(x) = \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega^c. \end{cases}$$

Let $\nu = (\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_N)$ be the outward unit normal vector field of $\partial\Omega$. The Green's formula reads as,

$$\int_\Omega u\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}dx + \int_\Omega v\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\nu_i dx,\ i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{6.1}$$

where $u \in W^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$, $v \in W^1 L_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$.

We will give the proof of the result below:

Lemma 6.1

$$W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) = \{u \in W^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \mid \overline{u} \in W^1 L_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)\}.$$

Proof Set

$$E = \{u \in W^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \mid \overline{u} \in W^1 L_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)\}.$$

Take $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ and let $g_i : \mathrm{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$g_i(x) = \begin{cases} (\partial u/\partial x_i)(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega^c. \end{cases}$$

Computing derivatives in the distribution sense and using the generalized Green's formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathrm{R}^N} u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx &= \int_\Omega u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx, \\ &= -\int_\Omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \varphi dx, \\ &= -\int_{\mathrm{R}^N} g_i \varphi dx, \ \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathrm{R}^N). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\overline{u}, g_i \in L_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we conclude that $u \in E$. On the other hand, take $u \in E$. We claim that $\gamma(u) = 0$. Indeed, by the definition of weak derivative and Green's identity it follows that for all $v \in W^{1,\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$ and $i = 1, \cdots, N$, we have

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\nu_i dx = 0.$$

and so

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(u)\nu_i w dx = 0, \ w \in C(\partial\Omega).$$

Because $\gamma(u)\nu_i \in L_\Phi(\partial\Omega)$ and $C(\partial\Omega)$ is dense (with respect to the norm topology) in $E_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\partial\Omega)$, we conclude that

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(u)\nu_i w dx = 0, \ w \in E_{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\partial\Omega).$$

By taking $w(x) = 1$ if $\gamma(u)\nu_i$ is positive, $w(x) = 0$ if $\gamma(u)\nu_i$ is zero and $w(x) = -1$ if $\gamma(u)\nu_i$ is negative, we conclude that $w \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega) \subset E^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\partial\Omega)$ and

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} |\gamma(u)\nu_i| d\sigma = 0.$$

So, $\gamma(u) = 0$ a.e. on the supoort of ν_i and because

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \text{supp}(\nu_i) = \partial\Omega,$$

we conclude that $\gamma(u) = 0$ and hence $u \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$. This finishes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Indeed, by lemma 6.1, $\overline{u} \in W^1 L_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Reminding that

$$W^1 L_\Phi(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{1,1}(\Omega), \tag{6.2}$$

we have $\overline{u} \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and by the Chain rule for $W^{1,1}$, (cf. Gilbarg & Trudinger [10]), we infer that $g(\overline{u}) \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and in addition,

$$\int_\Omega g(u)\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x_i}dx = \int_\Omega g'(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\varphi dx,\ \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

We will show next that $\overline{g(u)} \in W^1 L_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Indeed, on one hand, we have that $g(\overline{u}) = \overline{g(u)}$. On the other hand, setting

$$h_i(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial g(u)}{\partial x_i}(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega^c, \end{cases}$$

we have $\overline{g(u)}, h_i \in L^\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Therefore, $\overline{g(u)} \in W^1 L_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Now, using lemma 6.1 again, we obtain that $g(u) \in W_0^1 L_\Phi(\Omega)$ and

$$\frac{\partial g(u)}{\partial x_i} = g'(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 6.1. □

References

[1] R. A. Adams & J. F. Fournier, (2003) *Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, New York.

[2] K. J. Brown & H. Budin, (1977) *Multiple positive solutions for a class of nonlinear boundary value problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 60 pp. 329-338.

[3] K. J. Brown & H. Budin, (1979) *On the existence of positive solutions for a class of semilinear elliptic boundary value problems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 10 pp. 875-883.

[4] M. Chipot & P. Roy, (2014) *Existence results for some functional elliptic equations*, Differential Integral Equations 27 pp. 289-300.

[5] Ph. Clément, M. Garcia-Huidobro, R. Manśevich, K. Schmitt (2000) *Mountain pass type solutions for quasilinear elliptic equations*, Cal. Variations and Partial Differential Equations, Volume 11 pp. 33-62.

[6] Corrêa, Francisco Julio S. A.; Corrêa, Amanda Suellen S.; Santos Junior, João R. (2014) *Multiple ordered positive solutions of an elliptic problem involving the* pq*-Laplacian*. J. Convex Anal. 21, no. 4, pp 1023-1042.

[7] F. J. S. A. Corrêa, M. L. M. Carvalho, J. V. A. Goncalves & K. O. Silva, (2015) *Positive solutions of strongly nonlinear elliptic problems*, Asymptot. Anal. 93 pp. 1-20.

[8] E. Dancer & K. Schmitt, (1987) *On positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 101 pp. 445-452.

[9] M. García-Huidobro, L. V. Khoi, R. Manásevich & K. Schmitt, (1999) *On principal eigenvalues for quasilinear elliptic differential operators: an Orlicz-Sobolev space setting*, Nonlinear Differ. EqN. Appl. 6 pp. 207-225.

[10] D. Gilbarg & N. S. Trudinger, (2001) *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer.

[11] J. -P. Gossez, (1974) *Nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems for equations with raplidy (or slowly) incressing coefficients*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 190 pp.163-205.

[12] J. -P. Gossez, (1976) *Orlicz spaces, Orlicz-Sobolev spaces and strongly nonlinear elliptic problems*, Trabalho de Matemática 103.

[13] P. Hess, (1981) *On multiple positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 6 pp.951-961.

[14] Vy Khoi Le, (2009) *Some existence results and properties of solutions in quasilinear variational inequalities with general growth*, Differ. Equ. Dyn. Syst. 17 pp.343-364.

[15] A. Kufner, O. John & S. Fucik, (1977) *Functions Spaces*, Monographs and Textbooks on Mechanics of Solids and Fluids; Mechanics: Analysis. Noordhoff International Publishing, Leyden; Academia, Prague.

[16] N. H. Loc & K. Schmitt, (2009) *On positive solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations*, Differential Integral Equations 22 pp. 829-842.

[17] V. Mustonen & M. Tienari, (1999) *An eigenvalue problem for generalized Laplacian in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, 129A pp. 153-163.

[18] M. Tienari, (1994) *A degree theory for a class of mappings of monotone type in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. AI Math. Dissertationes 97 pp. 1-68.

Edcarlos D. Silva
José V.A. Goncalves
Kaye O. Silva

Universidade Federal de Goiás
Instituto de Matemática e Estatística
74001-970 Goiânia, GO - Brasil

Emails: edcarlos@ufg.br
goncalves.jva@gmail.com
kayeoliveira@hotmail.com